

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were originally filed in the present application.

Claims 1-16 have been rejected.

No claims have been amended.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of the following arguments.

In Sections 4 and 5 of the May 17, 2005, Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,509,913 to *Martin Jr., et al.* (hereinafter, simply "*Martin*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,693 to *Brodersen, et al.* (hereinafter, simply "*Brodersen*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Claim 1, which contains the unique and non-obvious limitations emphasized below:

1. A wireless communication device comprising:
 - a main controller capable of executing a basic operating system application program that operates communication functions of said wireless communication device and that controls a first graphical user interface (GUI) for interacting with a user; and
 - a memory coupled to said main controller capable of storing a first GUI configuration file and a second GUI configuration file, wherein said first GUI configuration file contains first GUI parameter data comprising a first plurality of text names and a corresponding plurality of data comprising at least one of: sounds, graphical images, text, menu options and a menu hierarchy associated with said first graphical user interface, and said second GUI configuration file contains second GUI parameter data comprising a second plurality of text names and a corresponding plurality of data comprising at least one of: sounds, graphical images, text, menu options and a menu hierarchy associated with a second graphical user interface, and wherein said main controller is operable to validate said second GUI parameter data by comparing a first text name checksum value contained in said first GUI

configuration file with a second text name checksum value contained in said second GUI configuration file. (emphasis added)

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the above-emphasized limitations are not disclosed, suggested, or even hinted at in the *Martin* reference, the *Brodersen* reference, or the combination of the *Martin* reference and the *Brodersen* reference.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner asserted that the *Martin* reference discloses a GUI configuration file containing GUI parameter text names and a corresponding plurality of data, citing Column 6, lines 18-27. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner mischaracterizes the teaching of the *Martin* reference.

The *Martin* reference describes a remote wireless computing device with a display for displaying screens or pages of information. *See Martin, col. 4, lines 39-40*. The configuration of the screens displayed may be determined by screen configuration information in a configuration file downloaded to the device by a controller within a network gateway. *See Martin, col. 5, lines 30-38*. Figure 2B, a diagram of a representative screen, shows the screen broken into eight areas, identified by reference numerals C1-C8. They are described as a plurality of components that together form the configured screen. *See Martin, col. 6, lines 8-10*. The screen configuration information determines and arranges the components, for example their location and contents. *See Martin, col. 6, lines 11-17*. The cited passage states “the screen configuration information [may be] provided by a markup or script language or other hypermedia that provides a description of the desired screen (MMI).” *Martin, col. 6, lines 17-20*. Furthermore, the passage provides a table indicating an assignment that

the screen configuration information could make of content sources to components. *See Martin, col. 6, lines 23-26, and Table 1.*

However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the *Martin* reference never states that the screen configuration information in the configuration file is associated with text names. The contents of the file may be textual — i.e., a markup or script language may be used to define the locations and contents of the components. And the textual reference numerals C1-C8 are used in the body of the specification and in Table 1 to identify the components in Figure 2. But the *Martin* reference does not teach that the text names “C1”, “C2”, etc. are used in the configuration file to identify the data defining the location and contents of each component. Indeed, the reference contains no teaching at all of how the components are identified: by text name, by number, or by another means.

Nor is the use of text names, rather than numbers or some other identifiers, inherent in the teaching that a markup or script language may be used to define the component data. The components could as easily be defined by a series of script statements, the first of which defines the first component, the second defines the second component, and so forth, wherein the position of the statement identifies which component it defines. The *Martin* reference simply contains no teaching as to the format of the contents of the configuration file. The Applicant respectfully submits that the *Martin* reference does not describe GUI parameter data comprising a first plurality of text names and a corresponding plurality of data as recited in independent Claim 1. The Applicant further submits that the *Brodersen* reference does nothing to overcome the shortcomings of the *Martin* reference.

Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledges that the *Martin* reference does not describe validating two configuration files by comparing checksums contained in the files. However, the Examiner asserts that such a limitation is taught in the *Brodersen* reference, citing Column 17, lines 51-60. Again, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner mischaracterizes the teaching of the reference.

The *Brodersen* reference describes a method for providing updates to a network of partially replicated relational database systems. *See Brodersen, col. 1, lines 16-18*. On occasion, both the database schema and the software used to access the database may change. *See Brodersen, col. 17, lines 27-29*. A system administrator may apply this upgrade to the central database and server. *See Brodersen, col. 17, lines 37-41*. The next time a remote user connects to the central server, he receives database upgrade files to upgrade his partial replica of the database. *See Brodersen, col. 17, lines 42-47*. At the same time, the *Brodersen* system will compare a checksum in the database upgrade files with a checksum in the remote user's configuration file to determine whether the remote user's software must be upgraded, as well. *See Brodersen, col. 17, lines 52-57*.

Thus, the *Brodersen* reference does not teach validating one of two files by comparing checksums contained in the files; instead it teaches comparing a checksum in a first file (database upgrade) with a checksum in a second file (configuration) to validate a third file (software). Nor do the two checksums in the *Brodersen* reference represent data within the files containing them, as recited in Claim 1. The Applicant respectfully submits that the *Brodersen* reference does not describe validating a second file by comparing a first checksum on data stored in a first file, the

checksum being contained in the first file, with a second checksum on data in the second file, the second checksum being contained in the second file, as recited in independent Claim 1. As the Examiner acknowledges, the *Martin* reference does nothing to overcome the shortcomings of the *Brodersen* reference.

As such, independent Claim 1 contains patentable subject matter over the *Martin* reference and the *Brodersen* reference. Also, dependent Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1 and contain all of the unique and non-obvious limitations recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claims 2-7 also are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Amended independent Claims 8 and 15 contains limitations that are analogous to the unique and non-obvious limitations recited in independent Claim 1. This being the case, Claims 8 and 15 are patentable over the *Martin* reference and the *Brodersen* reference. Furthermore, dependent Claims 9-14, which depend from Claim 8, and Claim 16, which depends from Claim 15, contain all of the unique and non-obvious limitations recited in their respective base claims. Thus, dependent Claims 9-14 and 16 also are patentable over the cited prior art references.

SUMMARY

For the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of pending claims and that this Application be passed to issue. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *jmockler@davismunck.com*.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 17 August 2005

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *jmockler@davismunck.com*



John T. Mockler
Registration No. 39,775